

REMARKS

The Notice of Non-Compliant Appeal Brief states that the Brief does not contain a concise explanation defined in each of the independent claims, citing 37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(v). More explicitly, the Notice states that the Summary of claim 1 does not point to the drawings numbers to describe the claim functionality. With respect to the Summary of claim 8, the Notice states that the Summary requires that the exact function specified to determine equivalence. The Notice states that the Summary of claim 8 must set forth the structure, material, or acts described in the specification as corresponding to each claimed function with reference to the specification, by page and line number, and to the drawings. The Notice states that any dependent claims to be argued must be placed under subheadings.

The Summary of claim 1 has been revised. Each claim element of the method claim references a particular step (or steps) depicted in Fig. 6. Further, each claim element references the specification by paragraph, page number, and line number.

The Summary of claim 8 has been revised. The Summary references an exact function of the means plus function claim language as embodied in the systems of Figs 4 and 5. The Summary references particular reference designators in Figs. 4 and 5, along with citations to the specification by paragraph, page, and line number.

The *Arguments Section* of the Appeal Brief has been revised to denote that the rejection of claims as unpatentable under U.S.C. 103(a) with respect to Suzuki (US 6,788,138) in view of Hayashi (US 6,697,634) is being argued as a single group. A subheading, ***CLAIMS 1-19***, has been added as a subheading in the *Arguments Section*. Likewise, the Appeal Brief has been revised to denote that the rejection of claims 20-22 as unpatentable under U.S.C. 103(a) with respect to Suzuki in view of Nicholls et al.

("Nicholls"; US 2004/0062216) is being argued as a single group. A subheading, ***CLAIMS 20-22***, has been added as a subheading in the *Arguments Section*.

The Applicant has made a good-faith effort to address the defects listed in the Notice of Non-Complaint Appeal Brief. In the event that the enclosed Appeal Brief is still found to be defective, the Applicant would appreciate the opportunity make further modifications and, would also appreciate specific suggestions to remedy the problems.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 20, 2007

/Donald C. Kordich/
Donald C. Kordich
Reg. No. 38,213